

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.upoto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/642,929	08/18/2003	Kenji Sakai	1010.2.1	3856
7331 09/17/2008 KIRTON & MCCONKIE 60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE			EXAMINER	
			GOUDREAU, GEORGE A	
SUITE 1800 SALT LAKE	CITY, UT 84111		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		1792	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/17/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Application No. Applicant(s) 10/642.929 SAKALET AL. Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit George A. Goudreau 1792 -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS. WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 October 2007. 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) Claim(s) 2-4.6-10 and 25 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) 2-4 and 6-10 is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 25 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are; a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abevance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some \* c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

Imformation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTC/G5/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_\_.

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date.

6) Other:

Notice of Informal Patent Application

Application/Control Number: 10/642,929 Page 2

Art Unit: 1792

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10-26-07' has been entered.

- The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the reference as applied in paragraph 4 of the previous office action on the merits.
- Claims 2-4, and 6-10 are allowed.

Application/Control Number: 10/642,929 Page 3

Art Unit: 1792

6. Applicant's arguments filed 10-26-07' have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

Applicant states that they have amended previously presented claim 25 to be in

independent form which means that this claim is now allowable over the prior art

of record.

The examiner must disagree.

The scope of newly presented claim 25 is broader than previously presented

claim 25 since it is not limited to a process in which the third cmp slurry must

contain an acid. Rather, newly presented claim 25 reads on processes in which

the third cmp slurry contains an alkali material such as ammonium hydroxide

instead of an acid.

7 Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner

George A. Goudreau at telephone number 571-272-1434.

/George A. Goudreau/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792

Application Number